

308160

JPRS 84419

27 September 1983

# East Europe Report

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 2205

19990607 112

**FBIS**

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**  
Approved for Public Release  
Distribution Unlimited

REPRODUCED BY  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22161

**DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4**

6  
52  
A04

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

27 September 1983

EAST EUROPE REPORT  
POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 2205

## CONTENTS

## INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

- Masaryk's Key Role in Reshaping 20th Century Europe Examined  
(Karoly Vigh; TISZATAJ, Jul 83) ..... 1

- Briefs  
Jablonski Receives Bulgarian Envoy ..... 20

## BULGARIA

- Tanzanian Parliamentary Delegation Arrives 13 September  
(Various sources, various dates) ..... 21

Met by Todorov  
Talks Begin  
Zhivkov Receives Delegation

- Agrarian Union Official Visits Sweden, Denmark  
(BTA, 13 Sep 83) ..... 23

- Vietnam National Holiday Marked, Envoy Speaks  
(BTA, 3 Sep 83) ..... 24

- Briefs  
New Jordanian Ambassador ..... 26

## GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

- Report, Critique of Guided Tour, Daily Life  
(Hermann Strahl; DIE TAGESZEITUNG, 24 Aug 83) ..... 27

## POLAND

- Glomp Condemns Ethical 'Irregularities' in Approach to Accords  
(Vatican City in Polish to Poland) ..... 33

Briefs		
	Barcikowski Visits Szczecin Shipyard	35
	Olszowski Meets Swedish Minister	35
ROMANIA		
Agachi	Addresses Festive Meeting on DPRK Holiday (AGERPRES, 8 Sep 83) .....	36
Briefs		
	Governmental Appointment	38
	Ministerial Appointment	38
	Peoples Council Appointment	38
YUGOSLAVIA		
Dr Jovan Djordjevic	Discusses Shortcomings in LCY Program (Jovan Djordjevic Interview; INTERVJU, 24 Jun 83) .....	39

MASARYK'S KEY ROLE IN RESHAPING 20TH CENTURY EUROPE EXAMINED

Szeged TISZATAJ in Hungarian Jul 83 pp 46-59

[Article by Karoly Vigh: "Masaryk and the Hungarians"]

[Text] We have been, and partially still are, inclined to judge the causes of pre-World War I Hungary's disintegration almost exclusively on the basis of works by Hungarian and Austrian historians, and of the memoirs of the prominent statesmen of that period. Since the 1970's, however, some of our renowned historians have been gazing beyond this narrow horizon and, using a whole library of literature on the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, are expounding their views on the Habsburg empire's downfall without focusing solely on Budapest or Vienna. Unfortunately, not even these authors have been devoting sufficient attention to Bohemia and Moravia, to the interrelations within the monarchy of Czech political and intellectual life after Palacky and Havlicek, including Czech-Hungarian relations. Yet new aspects obviously could reveal themselves to the viewer looking at the monarchy from Prague.

Even the names of such prominent Czech personalities as Tomas Masaryk barely receive mention in Hungarian works on the monarchy, although not only his scientific activity was impressive, but also his role as politician and statesman evoked wide response beyond the Leitha River [former border between Austria and Hungary]. The only exception in Hungarian historiography is Endre Kovacs who included among his historical profiles a sketch of Masaryk as well. Specifically his biography of Masaryk has provided the impetus for this essay, because it is unfortunate that the otherwise excellent sketch by Endre Kovacs makes no mention of Masaryk's Hungarian contacts, nor of his views on Hungarian history and the Hungarians.

The name of Masaryk does crop up in the seventh volume of the big Hungarian historical synthesis, but his ideological work is mentioned only in conjunction with the appearance of European radicalism at the turn of the century. Incidentally, I think it is debatable to "label" T. G. Masaryk as a bourgeois radical of the same ilk as the Hungarian bourgeois radicals. His was a personality far more complex than to fit neatly into a single social or ideological "pigeonhole." The author of the essay, too, seems to have felt this, because already on the next page he refers to the fact that Masaryk regarded himself strictly as a bourgeois liberal.

What was Tomas Garrigue Masaryk really, bourgeois radical or liberal thinker? What was his place among philosophers toward the end of the 19th century and

among statesmen in the first third of the 20th century? What was the road like that he traveled from Hodonin, the village where he was born, to Hradcany, the one-time royal palace in Prague? And the question we would mainly like to answer: What can be said about his Hungarian contacts and his views on the Hungarians?

His birthplace was Hodonin in south Moravia, close to the Hungarian and Austrian borders, along the dividing line between the Czech and the Slovak ethnic groups. Here he was born on 7 March 1850. Masaryk's start at the junction points of small central European peoples decisively influenced his entire life. Masaryk himself has this to say of his origin: "My father was a Hungarian citizen, born in Kopcany (a village south of Bratislava--K.V.), and thus I was a Hungarian citizen by birth. It is true that I was born in Hodonin, in the southernmost part of Moravia, but this was close to the Hungarian border. My parents did not speak Hungarian. But I frequently relaxed on Lake Balaton, spending many pleasant hours there, and traveled several times through Hungary. In behalf of the Slovak people, I followed Hungary's culture and politics. And I spoke Hungarian well" (T. G. Masaryk, "A Nemzetiségi Kerdes" ((The Nationality Problem)), Bratislava, 1935, p 194).

In several of his works, Masaryk professes to being a Slovak because of his Kopcany origin, the village then being a part of Hungary. He stresses his Slovak sentiments also in his notable work "A Vilagforradalom" (World Revolution), page 287. Along the Moravian-Slovak border, between the Czech and the Slovak ethnic groups, Masaryk encountered many linguistic and other similarities, and these factors decisively influenced the future statesman and president's views regarding Czechoslovakism. As we very well know, Masaryk too supported the view that the Czechs and the Slovaks were a unified nation, and the basis of this illusion was his belief that merely dialectical differences existed between Czech and Slovak.

Masaryk's father was a coachman on an imperial estate in south Moravia, and his mother worked as a housekeeper there. Although his father apprenticed young Tomas to a blacksmith, chance--the assistance of his one-time schoolmaster--nevertheless enabled him to continue his studies. Fate was kind to him a second time as well, when he was expelled from the German secondary school in Brno because of his Czech nationalist sentiments. He found an influential patron also then: the police-superintendent father of a student he was tutoring took him to Vienna, where he subsequently graduated from secondary school in 1872. It is interesting to note that in his final examination in geography he had to answer questions about statistics on the nationalities and religions in Hungary.

Endowed with many talents, the young man learned also French, English, Russian and Polish, in addition to German. He drew excellent sketches and studied music. Especially his knowledge of literature was impressive, but he followed closely Viktor Adler's movement and also studied thoroughly Marx's principal work, "Das Kapital." Masaryk obtained a doctorate in philosophy in Vienna (his doctoral dissertation was on Plato) and was habilitated as a private docent there. He spent a year in Leipzig where he met Charlotte Garrigue, the daughter of a Huguenot family that had emigrated to America. Visiting Europe, she was still able to hear Liszt play in Weimar. After their marriage in 1878,

Masaryk adopted his wife's family name as his middle name. They lived happily for 45 years. This American girl soon became an enlightened Czech woman. She joined the Social Democratic Party in 1905 and played an active role in the women's movement. Best known of their children was Jan, Czechoslovakia's foreign minister after World War II, until the year of change [1948] in Czechoslovakia.

Masaryk the scientist accepted in 1882 the invitation of the Czech University in Prague to occupy the chair of philosophy. Criticizing the irrationalism of his time (the basic tenet of his philosophy was: Jesus and not Ceasar), he turned to the great Czech philosophers and political thinkers: Komensky, Palacky and Havlicek. Subsequently, in the spirit of realism and as a result of positivism, Masaryk and his contemporaries (Goll, Gebauer and Hostinsky) participated in an ideological struggle to disprove a romantic legend. With scientific thoroughness, they proved that the Dvur Kralove and Zelena Hora manuscripts, old Bohemian epics that had fostered nationalist public opinion for decades, were forgeries and had been manufactured around 1820. This revelation in 1886 turned Czech nationalist public opinion against Masaryk and his group. Paying no heed to all this, Masaryk, Kramar, Kaizl and others were striving to raise their nation to the level of modern Europe. Reminiscing on Masaryk, a contemporary called him not without reason "a European researcher and a Czech nationalist." In 1891 the aforementioned great trio were elected to the Austrian Reichsrat. At that time Masaryk's political behavior was still moderated by his ties to German culture, his unconditional loyalty to the monarchy, and by Palacky's professed philosophy of history ("If there were no Austria, we would have to invent one"), but Masaryk's speeches within the delegations, especially on the Serbo-Croatian issue, attracted attention. This is why Beni Kallay's spies watched Masaryk along the entire way when he toured Bosnia and Hercegovina.

Because of the conflicts in Czech internal politics, Masaryk resigned from the Austrian Reichsrat in 1893 and devoted his attention to writing several important works. Jointly with Drtina and Kaizl, he founded the journal NASE DOBA (Our Epoch). His works "Ceska Otazka" (The Czech Question), "Jan Hus" and the historical profile "Karel Havlicek" actually served to build a great intellectual bridge from Husitism to the turn of the century, because in them Masaryk attempted to prove that humanism could be identified as the continuous thread in Czech history, and that the Czech people were the people of humanism. He himself was laboring for the integral continuation of this humanistic heritage, in behalf of his nation and for the salvation of Europe. Of course, this conception of Masaryk's is just as unacceptable and one-sided as in Hungary the idealism professed even later that Hungarian history consisted of incessant struggle to defend and reestablish independent statehood.

On socialism, Masaryk was actually close to the views held by the Webbs and Shaw. Therefore he can best be listed among the Fabianists. In the 1890's he joined the Vienna group of the Fabian Society. At the same time he began to read and study the works of Marx and Engels, in the German original. His interpretation of socialism was simplified. He did not recognize the importance of dialectics, and although he accepted the theory of class struggle, he attributed a role also to other factors in the formation of history. He pointed out that the middle class sandwiched between the two basic classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, would not become proletarianized in the Marxian

sense, and that its role--from the viewpoint of both other classes--was far more significant than Marx and Engels had assumed. In sum, as Masaryk wrote in 1899, from the classics of Marxism he had learned that "the social question represents unrest and bitterness, and also aspiration, for thousands and millions."

Masaryk's fame reached also Budapest, and the Hungarian progressives took notice of his activity. His essay "Polygamy and Monogamy" appeared in the July and September 1908 issues of the Budapest journal *NO ES A TARSADALOM* (Woman and Society). He gained prominence in bourgeois intellectual circles of the Hungarian capital especially with his fight against alcoholism, his research into this problem and his efforts to spread information on it. Emil Koranyi translated into Hungarian Masaryk's essay "Ethics and Alcoholism." The National League of Societies Against Alcoholism published it in Budapest in 1910 in its series of publications, as a brochure of one printed sheet. Recognizing alcoholism's general threat to society, Masaryk emphasized: "Alcoholism is the enemy of social and political equality and freedom, and it conflicts with democracy as well . . . because there is social and political bondage and slavery on the one hand, and exploitation desiring to subjugate everything on the other."

Masaryk's works published in Hungarian were a good letter of recommendation for the Czech scientist's visit to Budapest. On the invitation of the Society for Social Sciences, Masaryk came to the Reform Club in Budapest in 1910, for a direct exchange of views with a group of Hungarian radical intellectuals. Not the politician and the member of the Austrian Reichsrat was invited, but the scientist who helped to disprove the Dvur Kralove and Zelena Hora manuscripts as forgeries, fought for the freedom of scientific research, and braved accusations of being a "hireling of the Jews" by swimming against the tide of nationalist antisemitic sentiment and writing a pamphlet in the interest of reopening the Polna ritual murder case. The young Hungarian radicals welcomed the Prague university professor whose philosophical and sociological works evoked the respect and admiration of Hungarian progressive intellectuals.

Recalling Masaryk's Budapest visit, Ruzsem Vambery in a treatise compared Masaryk with the Hungarian philosopher Agoston Pulszky whose useful activity in our country was likewise the exposition of the philosophy of Hume, Comte and Spencer. In his treatise on Masaryk's sociology, Vambery compared Masaryk's scientific activity with that of the group formed around the Society for Social Sciences at the turn of the century in Hungary. According to Vambery, Bodog Somlo's group was characterized by the same positivism and economic materialism as were characteristic of Masaryk's intellectual horizon. We learn from Vambery that Masaryk's criticism of historical materialism in his "Die philosophischen und soziologischen Grundlagen des Marxismus" (The Philosophical and Sociological Foundations of Marxism) brought the young Hungarian bourgeois radicals close to the Czech professor. As Vambery writes: "From him we learned how to rise above Marx through Marx. In the eternal struggle between matter and the mind, Masaryk sided with the mind and demanded a worthy place within society for the individual as the expresser of thought."

Regardless of how much Vambery overestimates--at the expense of Marx--the significance of Masaryk's scientific activity, especially in the field of sociology, he too admits that in sociology Masaryk did not belong among the founders



of sociological schools. Vambery ends his analysis with an interesting comparison: Both Mazzini and Kossuth were European representatives of the national idea, but they found the culmination of their historical missions in international (today we might say supranationalist--K.V.) solutions, in a United States of Europe and in a Danube Confederation. In the same way Masaryk professed that "universal federalism is mankind's only reasonable objective" (Rusztém Vambery, "Masaryk's Sociology," in "Masaryk G. T. Elete, Mukodese es Hatasa" ((T. G. Masaryk's Life, Activity and Influence)), Bratislava, 1930, pp 59-64).

Besides Vambery, also Jaszi, Karolyi and others mention--although only in references--Masaryk's relations with the Hungarian progressives of his time. Gyorgy Lukacs, too, devotes attention to Masaryk's person. In these references we read the final conclusion that Masaryk and his group enjoyed the support of the economically strong and politically influential Czech bourgeoisie, as well as of the bourgeois intellectuals who sympathized with the national aspirations of the Young Czechs. In Hungary, however, Oszkar Jaszi and his group could not rely on such a social base, because the Hungarian bourgeoisie was weak. Even the left wing of the Independence Party, the Karolyi Party, was able to become a political force only after a lost war. In his memoirs Karolyi himself writes that they had lacked the policy and foresight that had led Masaryk to go abroad after the outbreak of war and to become leader of the Czech national resistance.

Prior to his Budapest visit, Masaryk had been maintaining contact for years with the young Slovak intellectuals studying in Prague. The Slovak university students informed him in detail of the situation in Hungary and of the Slovak people's problems. Regarding Masaryk as their intellectual leader, they founded the journal HLAS (Voice). Rallying around this journal, they later played an important role in establishing Czech-Slovak unity. They too invited in their midst the Czech professor who in his Budapest lecture in 1911 advocated Czech-Slovak mutualism.

At the beginning of the 20th century, in the spirit of Palacky's legacy, Masaryk's grand political design included a monarchy on democratic principles, one in which the majority Slavic peoples, and the Czechs in particular, had to gain control. Masaryk attempted to influence to this end Viennese foreign policy. In his plans he wanted to strengthen the monarchy's international position by countering with a strong British orientation the pressure threatening from the kaiser's Germany and the czar's Russia. His intentions at that time coincided entirely with the interests of British big capital and the aspirations of British foreign policy. The Foreign Office and the leading British political writers considered Masaryk suitable for the realization of these plans. The British journalists Wickham Steed and Seton-Watson (known under his pen name of Scotus Viator) and the American Charles Crane (a personal acquaintance of Wilson's!) gained Masaryk access to British and American journals, societies, and even to the British and American governments.

Masaryk's position within the monarchy and his international contacts were reinforced in 1907 by running in the parliamentary elections. Together with Drtina, he won under a program of Czech realism and again became a member of the Austrian Reichsrat. His name attracted international attention with the Zagreb and Vienna cases. Both cases had Hungarian implications. In Zagreb

in 1909, 53 Croatian intellectuals and peasants were accused of high treason. It turned out that Hungarian agents had forged documents to incriminate them. Facing execution and remembering Masaryk's previous good Yugoslav relations, they asked him to come to Zagreb. He could not refuse. He went to Zagreb, attended the trial, and on the basis of his report the Reichsrat quashed the proceedings. The other scandal was the Friedjung case. This renowned Austrian historian had published false documents as evidence of Serb plots against Austria. It soon turned out that the documents had been forged. Supilo, a Croatian member of parliament, revealed to Masaryk that agents of Aehrenthal, the foreign minister, and Forgach, the ambassador, were behind the forgeries. With the positive role he played in these two cases, Masaryk gained exceptionally great prestige in Yugoslav political circles which handsomely rewarded this "champion of justice" by supporting the new state, Czechoslovakia, during the war and in the peace treaties near Paris after the war.

It should be emphasized that the idea of breaking away from Austria never even occurred in Masaryk's concept prior to World War I. To the contrary, he wanted to strengthen the monarchy not only internationally, but in domestic politics as well. He favored developing cooperation with Britain and France, and democratic transformation of the empire. He advocated civil reforms. When war broke out, before emigrating, he decided that a last attempt had to be made to gain autonomy for the Czechs from the official circles in Austria. Only when he became convinced that nothing good could be expected for his people from the Viennese military machine intoxicated by the "victories" in the war did Masaryk bring himself to say "pereat Austria et fiat justitia!" (may Austria perish and let there be justice).

Seton Watson writes of his historic meeting with Masaryk: "The program that Masaryk outlined to me at a secret meeting in a Rotterdam hotel in October 1914 was fulfilled almost to the last word by October 1918 . . ." This same Scottish journalist had this to say about Masaryk: "There is not another statesman of similar responsibility in Europe who could formulate general policy so broadly and clearly, not only Czech policy but European policy as well."

In the autumn of 1914, then, Masaryk traveled to Holland with ready plans that essentially called for crushing Austro-Hungary and establishing central Europe. Through Seton Watson, he submitted his memorandum to the Allied diplomatic missions in London, and with that the Czech emigre machinery began to roll. Mobilizing his old and new friends, Masaryk traveled to Italy for important meetings, and then to Geneva. He traveled in western Europe with the Austrian consul's knowledge, legally, on a valid passport. It sounds almost unbelievable that a member of the Habsburg empire's parliament was traveling about in Europe with the knowledge of the Austrian authorities, conspiring with enemy diplomats to break up the monarchy, and Austrian Intelligence and Security knew nothing about this!

In its concept Masaryk's memorandum--it was the basis of the struggle to create Czechoslovakia--combined the principles of constitutional law, history and the law of nature. In other words, it did not confine itself to the historical borders of the Bohemian kingdom. On the basis of the "law of nature," it wanted to annex also Slovakia, the northern part of Hungary, to the newly formed state. In their subsequent plans as well, the Czech emigres insisted on annexing so-called Slovakia to Bohemia and Moravia. At the end of the war, on the

basis of his negotiations in America, Masaryk laid claim also to Subcarpathian Russia.

Using various financial resources (mostly donations from Czechs and Slovaks living in America, lecture fees, etc.), Masaryk lived through the four years of war in various cities of Europe, Asia and America. From December 1914 to January 1915 he was in Rome, and then in Geneva until September. Between September 1915 and May 1917 he lived in Paris and London. From May 1917 to 1 April 1918 he was in Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev and Vladivostok. On 6-20 April he was in the Far East and Tokyo. Finally, from 20 April to 20 November 1918 he lived in Washington. He returned home from the American capital in December 1918, which was already after the Czechoslovak Republic's formation. The Czech statesman completed this huge and exhausting travel schedule--full of exciting negotiations, important diplomatic and political talks, and propaganda lectures--at the age of 64 to 68. Benes became his closest associate who plunged into work with youthful zeal and exceptional toughness. He was indefatigable in everything from organization to conspiracy, and he was not particular about what means he employed. Benes was assigned to Paris where he worked together with the third member of the triumvirate, Milan Rastislav Stefanik, a Slovak. The Czechoslovak Legion in Russia, organized mostly of Czech prisoners of war and about 90,000 strong by the end of the war, lent due emphasis to the indefatigable activity of Masaryk and his coworkers. The Allies welcomed the counterrevolutionary stand of the Legion. It proclaimed the formation of an independent Czechoslovakia already on 20 March 1917 and recognized the Czech National Council in Paris as the provisional Czechoslovak government.

Masaryk's political reputation had preceded him in the West already before the war. He was able to influence the leading Allied statesmen on many important questions. Oszkar Jaszi, whose views on solving the problems of small nations differed in many respects from the views held by Masaryk, credibly established that "perhaps nobody else had more influence than President Masaryk on President Wilson's policy, on the principles and even the details of his policy" (Oszkar Jaszi: "The Teachings of President Masaryk" in "Masaryk G. T. Elete, Mukodese es Hatasa," Bratislava, 1930, p 76).

The concept that Masaryk developed during World War I can be read in its most mature and comprehensive form in his work "Nova Evropa. Stanovisko Slovanske" (The New Europe. The Slavic Standpoint), Prague, 1920. A part of this work first appeared in installments, from 16 April 1918 on, in CESKOSLOVENSKY DELNIK (Czechoslovak Worker), a newspaper published in Russia. Its English and French translations were published in October 1918. One of the lines of reasoning in this work is to justify the existence of small states and the need to form new ones. He saw German imperialism and Pan-Germanism as the main threat to small nations. And in central and eastern Europe, the Austro-Hungarian empire and European Turkey were in the way of the small nations. Therefore these multinational states had to be liquidated.

In Masaryk's opinion, it was necessary to strive for relative justice when forming national states. This meant asserting the principle that the minorities within a state should be as small as possible, but at the same time they must be guaranteed their civil rights (today we would say human rights--K.V.). Noteworthy is Masaryk's idea that in some instances the drawing of borders

should be only a temporary and provisional measure. When the people "have calmed down," it would be possible to readjust the ethnic and minority borders without any excitement, on the basis of objective considerations. Otherwise, according to Masaryk, in the new Europe there would be free minorities that would play an important role in organizing Europe, and their task would be to urge the development of "real internationalism."

In his "Nova Evropa," Masaryk was opposed to solving the problem of minorities by resettlement. But Benes, his closest collaborator, did the exact opposite a quarter century later. It will be remembered that he not only expelled millions of Germans from the country, but would have liked to solve also the Hungarian question in this manner.

On the basis of the provisions of the peace treaties signed after World War I and in the practice of the League of Nations, the principle demanded by Masaryk was realized that the minority question must not be considered an internal affair. The arbitration mechanism demanded by Masaryk was established. And the Allied Powers included in the peace treaties provisions for the protection of minorities and had their small allies conclude minority treaties. For example, Austria with Czechoslovakia, Germany with Poland, and Czechoslovakia with Poland. International guaranties for the protection of minorities seemed to be perfect. But in fact it turned out that minority grievances were not solved, not even the international forums were able to settle the problems by peaceful means, and as fascism gained ground it became increasingly obvious that Nazi Germany was using minority grievances only as a means to advance its plans to subjugate entire Europe. And Germany's allies acted no better. The best example of this was specifically the Munich policy against Czechoslovakia.

Masaryk envisaged a Europe in which "everyone could love his own nation without hating others." And he warned his own nation that ". . . no lie can be based on the culture of any nation." Concerning the new Europe that Masaryk conceived in the last year of the war, however, we are forced to establish that none of these noble ideas and objectives was realized in the Europe of the period between the two world wars. At the end of World War I and subsequently at the Paris peace conferences, with the effective cooperation of Masaryk and Benes, there emerged imperialistic peace treaties such that helped to create on the ruins of the Austro-Hungarian empire new states that were again multinational states. Through their selfish and nationalistic policies, the political elites of the so-called successor states (Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Romania), including also Masaryk's group, strived to keep the territories awarded them in the peace treaties, while they employed the various methods of political and cultural oppression against their minorities, including more than 3.5 million Hungarians.

When in December 1918 Masaryk the scientist and statesman returned home after 4.5 years of successful work abroad, he was driven victoriously to Hradcany as the president of a new central European state, the Czechoslovak Republic. He occupied this high office for nearly two decades, and the two ideals mentioned the most frequently in conjunction with his presidency were humanism and democracy. An outstanding personality such as Masaryk undeniably left his imprint on the country. Masaryk's humanism and democracy permeated all the peoples and social classes. And yet his ideals were unable to fully assert themselves.

The main reason for this must be sought in the fact that the developed and centralized Czechoslovak state apparatus and sociopolitical structure had been built more according to the concepts of Benes. A contributing factor to all this was the elder statesman's increasing isolation from the outside world during the last years of his life.

Reviewing Masaryk's presidency, what we want to investigate primarily is how he applied his minority policy to the Hungarians. To outline this practical activity, however, we must know first of all what his attitude was toward the Hungarians.

Masaryk's views on Hungarian history and Hungary were the view of the politician, not of the scientist. In his articles, treatises and public statements during the war and after the peace treaties, Masaryk considers the Hungarian question exclusively from the viewpoint of founding the Czechoslovak state. Czechoslovakia, he declared, was "the restoration of the old Bohemian (Greater Moravian) state; originally the Czechs and the Slovaks had been united, but the Magyars conquered Pannonia and subjugated the Slovaks. The Czechs and the Slovaks are one nation and have a common language" (T. G. Masaryk, "A Nemzeti-segi Kerdes," Bratislava, 1935, p 138). He discusses the Czech and Slovak aspects of Hungarian history mostly in his "Nova Evropa." Reviewing the significance of the Czechoslovak state, he emphasizes the central location in Europe of Bohemia and Slovakia, which can thus serve as a barrier to Pan-German imperialism. His historical retrospection goes back only as far as 1526, "when Bohemia entered into a personal union with Austria and Hungary." Peculiarly, his opinion of that period is that "actually only Slovakia had remained free, and thus it was Slovakia that figured in the union." According to Masaryk, prewar Hungary's liberation from Turkish rule was possible "only through the joint efforts of Bohemia and Austria."

His opinion of the Hungarian revolution of 1848 and of Hungary's role in modern history is as follows: "To this day the Hungarians have been living on the political revolution of 1848, and on Kossuth's reputation in particular; and yet the Hungarians were oppressing other peoples in the country already then." He then quotes Cavour, in whose opinion "the Hungarians are fighting for their own freedom, but are not letting others be free."

While Masaryk recognizes the Hungarians' love of freedom only in the above form and with the above limitations, he at the same time regards the Hungarians as "very aristocratic people" because of the large nobility, and he calls the system of government in the period of dualism "oligarchic absolutism." Summarily dismissing the Hungary of the period of compromise with Austria, he fails to take into consideration that Eotvos and Deak's generation laid the foundations of parliamentary government and, to a certain extent, advanced this form of government in the entire monarchy. Masaryk's prejudice against the Hungarian ruling classes and against dualistic Hungary is so great that he does not deign to notice the liberal system of government whose principles, laid down in laws and in the constitution, modernized the power apparatus in Hungary. Masaryk's later Western European allies still believed at that time that Europe ended at the eastern border of Hungary.

But it is likewise true that in the later decades of the period of dualism, around the turn of the century, the fiction of a "unified Hungarian political

nation" and Hungarian national hegemony greatly curtailed liberalism in Hungary and hampered efforts to gain independence from Austria. For domestic politics there followed from all this a definite rejection of the political demands raised by the popular masses, especially of the demand to guarantee the right to vote, and disregard for the political and cultural needs of the nationalities. When Masaryk became politically active, this was the Hungary he encountered. Thus when the ruling nation's nationalism intensified the nationalism of the national minorities, Masaryk naturally supported the political groups of the Slovaks and other national minorities, in their struggle against the Hungarian government. Then during the war he presented to the politicians of the Allied Powers facts on the oppression of the national minorities in Hungary. In the postwar years Masaryk wrote: "The French, British and Americans recognized this danger, and I must admit that a large part of my work abroad was to explain this question to the peoples of the Allied Powers. I played a major role in the condemnation of this policy. However, this was not only my human right, but also my human duty" (T. G. Masaryk, "A Nemzetisegi Kerdes," Bratislava, 1935, pp 19-21).

After complete victory in his political and diplomatic battles, Masaryk returned home and assumed his duties as chief of state just at the time when the bourgeois democratic system in Hungary, which included also his one-time ideological comrades, was undergoing a serious crisis. Karolyi, Jaszi and the others were disappointed not only with Wilsonism, but also in Masaryk, their comrade of yesterday, who did not lend any moral or political support to the Karolyi government that was coping with serious domestic and international political problems. When the Hungarian Soviet Republic was proclaimed in the spring of 1919, Masaryk--bearing in mind the Czech working class that was becoming revolutionized--publicly assured the Social Democratic leaders on 3 April that Czechoslovak participation in an intervention against proletarian power in Hungary was out of question. But at the same time the Ministry of Defense in Prague, under the direction of officers from the Allied Powers, was secretly making preparations for an attack. And the Czech bourgeois press was influencing public opinion in favor of intervention by fabricating reports of armed Hungarian attacks. As we very well know, this intervention soon occurred, and it is typical of the Czech bourgeoisie's appetite that it was planning to annex to Czechoslovakia not only Salgotarjan, but Vac and Miskolc as well.

In spite of the preceding, in the period after the signing of the Treaty of Trianon it was nevertheless Masaryk who tried to strike a conciliatory tone toward Hungary and the Hungarian minority annexed to Czechoslovakia. He declared: "I not only understand the Hungarians, but they also have my sympathies. It is quite understandable that it hurts them--yes, I said that it hurts them--to see their historically famous, thousand-year-old country collapse. But that cannot be helped. The Hungarians must become reconciled to it. They must adjust to the present situation if they want to live in this country" (T. G. Masaryk, "A Nemzetisegi Kerdes," p 195).

Masaryk felt that if the Hungarians abandoned the old concept of St. Stephen's state, he would easily be able to come to a compromise with them. Fully aware of the old monarchy's economic unity, however, he admitted: "The traces of having lived together for a thousand years cannot simply be erased" (ibid, p 193).

For considerations of realpolitik, he attempted to reach a compromise even with counterrevolutionary Hungary. Thanks to this fact, the Teleki government was able to start talks on the normalization of relations between the two countries already in March 1921, in Bruck, Austria. Subsequently, in May 1921, Foreign Minister Banffy met with his counterpart, Benes, in Marianske Lazne. From Miklos Banffy's memoirs, stored in the Raday Collection, we know that the Hungarian foreign minister discussed with Benes also the readjustment of the ethnic borders. Banffy claims that in these talks, regarded as preliminary, the Czechoslovak side was already willing to agree to significant readjustments. Lajos Taky, the Hungarian minister in Prague, attributed this primarily to President Masaryk's willingness to compromise. Teleki was succeeded as prime minister by Istvan Bethlen. The latter was pleased to take cognizance of Banffy's reports but felt that it would create a problem in international law if Hungary voluntarily renounced claims to some of the territory that the Treaty of Trianon took away from Hungary. In the end also certain international political events--for example, the attempt by Charles IV to return to Hungary--made it impossible to continue the Czechoslovak-Hungarian talks that had started so promisingly.

Retaining the Czechoslovak-Hungarian border that was termed a strategic border, Masaryk emphasized the advantages of the system's inherent democracy and offered it as a promising prospect to the Hungarian minority. In Masaryk's opinion, the Hungarian minority could only gain from the change. For he felt that minority status "leads to greater activity, and the new environment and contact with another culture enrich the minority's life." He found confirmation of his assumption in a statement by Zsigmond Moricz who, after visiting the republic, wrote that in Czechoslovakia "he found Hungarians with a new look, socially and culturally European Hungarians" (T. G. Masaryk, "A Nemzetisegi Kerdes," op cit, p 190).

The most durable in Masaryk's concept of the nationality problem is the following statement, with its admonition that seems timely even today: "In a state where there are national minorities, it is the task of the majority nation to regulate with understanding the status of the minorities in relation to the majority, and its own status within the state. One must not wait and see what the minorities want, demand or desire. The concessions must not be geared to how loudly a minority is demanding its privileges." In the interest of developing in Czechoslovakia a solution to the nationality problem that could then serve as a model for the rest of Europe, he proposes the following: "We should study more thoroughly how the nationality question has been solved elsewhere, for example, in Switzerland, Belgium, etc." He hopes that "with time we will succeed in finding a specifically Czechoslovak way of solving the nationality question."

Above I have presented Masaryk's views on the nationality question in very broad outlines. He had ample and frequent opportunity to express his views on this subject. The extracted statements were made during presidential audiences with delegations of Hungarians and foreign personalities in Prague, and during the president's tours of Slovakia and Subcarpathian Russia in 1921 and 1930. The democratic and humanistic content of those statements is undeniable. But we must also realize that Masaryk the president, for carefully weighed tactical reasons, wanted to disarm with his lofty statements the minority deputies who often struck an opposing and critical tone.

However, the humanism and democracy were never a question of tactics in Masaryk's practical politics. And it must likewise be emphasized that on the nationality question he not only stated lofty principles, but also showed a willingness to take actions unparalleled in central and southeastern Europe. The best example of this is the founding of a Czechoslovak Hungarian society for science and the arts, popularly known as the Masaryk Academy. But this story and its significance seem to want a separate chapter.

The antecedents of this event of national significance date back to the time when a delegation of Sarlo ["Sickle," a left-wing organization of young Hungarian intellectuals in Czechoslovakia] members obtained an audience with President Masaryk. Edgar Balogh describes it in his biography "Hetproba" (Seven Ordeals). When Lajos Scherer, the editor of the left-wing student newspaper MI LAPUNK (Our Paper) printed in the Vigh printshop in Lucenec, was suspended as teacher of the Lucenec Hungarian secondary school, the Sarlo members decided to turn with their complaints to the president of the republic, because the teacher's persecution threatened the Sarlo newspaper's very existence. Besides the Scherer case, Edgar Balogh and the other members of the delegation used the audience as an opportunity to express their opinion regarding the situation of the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia, and to present their views on what would have to be done in the future.

The president granted the Sarlo delegation an audience on 17 January 1930. Edgar Balogh and two fellow students presented themselves at Hradcany Castle in Prague. The president received them as representatives of the cause of the entire Hungarian minority. After submitting the Scherer memorandum, Edgar Balogh read a brief address in Slovak, telling the president that after the creative activity of the president's generation there would have to come something new to resolve the worsening economic and social contradictions. Balogh conveyed the Hungarian youths' principled standpoint that complete equality of the nation and national minorities had to be asserted. He also informed the president of plans to conduct a questionnaire survey that would accurately map the popular strength of the Hungarian minority, to establish a minority academy for scientific research, and to organize an East European Institute "that cannot be split up according to national borders."

The president heard Edgar Balogh's address and at first answered in German: "Yes, Hungary was nice. But you are right when you now want to establish for yourselves a new way of life." He went on to encourage them that Hungarian youths should now study at Czechoslovak universities and advance culturally also within the new framework, to serve the Hungarian people in science.

The Scherer case was brought up, and gifts were presented: four issues of VETES (Sowing), eight issues of UJ SZO (New Word), and the 1929 issues of MI LAPUNK, bound in red. "Yes, the Lucenec teacher's newspaper," commented the president. And then he suddenly asked an unexpected question while taking out his notebook and a gold pencil: "You have not come across other mistakes besides this dismissal?"

Emboldened by the question, they listed the grievances: the Slovak League's policy of forceful Slovakization; the forced settlement of Czech legionnaires and Slovaks in the entirely Hungarian Zitny Ostrov and in Hungarian-inhabited



areas in general; the fate of the thousands deprived of their citizenship; the incitement against the national minorities, etc. After 45 minutes the small Hungarian delegation stood up to leave, when Zoltan Boross asked the president whether he had any message for the minority youths. The president picked up the Hungarian newspapers from his desk and only said this much by way of parting: "I will never be against you Hungarians!"

This is how the audience of Edgar Balogh's delegation with the president of the Czechoslovak Republic ended. The message, and the presidential measure to reinstate Lajos Scherer (he also received 3000 korunas from Masaryk's privy purse!) were a great moral and political victory for the Sarlo members. Zoltan Boross wrote a lengthy article about the audience; the article appeared in the 1 February 1930 issue of the Bratislava HIRADO (Courier). In it Boross also protested against the Slovak League's denationalization efforts, in response to a chauvinistic attack against the Sarlo members in SLOVENSKA POLITIKA (Slovak Politics), the Slovak League's daily. News of the audience reached also Budapest. An article by the notorious right-wing journalist, Istvan Milotay, reported in the columns of MAGYARORSZAG (Hungary) Edgar Balogh's successful audience with the president, but under the following typical, fact-distorting headline: "Masaryk Aiding the Bolshevik Sarlo Members of North Hungary" (6 September 1931).

Barely six months after the audience in Hradcany Castle, President Masaryk and his retinue visited Central and South Slovakia. On 12 September, he visited the grave of Imre Madach in Dolny Strekov and, in a surprise gesture, placed a wreath on the grave, with the inscription: "To the Author of 'Az Ember Tragediaja' (The Tragedy of Man), T. G. Masaryk." Surprise mounted when the president delivered a nice Hungarian speech praising Madach and his great work. The next day in Lucenec, after the welcoming address by Arpad Kovy, a Calvinist minister and the spokesman for the Hungarian cultural societies, Masaryk made an announcement that virtually threw the entire Hungarian public opinion in a fever. The president replied in Hungarian to the 18-member cultural delegation and said, among other things, the following: "To demonstrate my sincere respect for culture also by deeds, from the fund set up on the occasion of my 80th birthday I have decided to allot a suitable sum for the establishment of a Hungarian society for science, literature and the fine arts."

Masaryk's announcement surprised even his immediate retinue. The Czech, Slovak and Hungarian press--the papers of the governing party as well as those of the opposition--all reported the president's announcement with great admiration. The only dissonant tone was that of the extreme nationalist Hlinka Party's SLOVAK; it noted with bitter envy: "President Masaryk is establishing a scientific and artistic academy for the Hungarians, something that not even the Slovaks have as yet."

Establishment of the Masaryk Academy was made possible by a grant of one million korunas that the president made for cultural purpose at the end of January 1931 to Czechoslovakia's Hungarian minority, from the 20-million-koruna fund set up as the nation's gift to mark his 80th birthday. News of the president's foundation met with joyful response among the entire Hungarian minority. Writers, scientists, artists and students expressed the hope that the fund would be used and invested with strict objectivity, independently of the

political parties' interests. The Czechoslovak Hungarian Society for Science, Literature and the Fine Arts, popularly known as the Masaryk Academy, held its constituent assembly on 8 November 1931, in the mirror hall of the Primate's Palace in Bratislava, with great ceremony. We know of the society's history primarily from Gyula Popely's excellent book: "A Csehszlovákiai Magyar Tudományos, Irodalmi és Kepzomuveszeti Tarsasag" (The Czechoslovak Hungarian Society for Science, Literature and the Fine Arts), Bratislava, 1973. Below we are reporting this important episode in our cultural history mostly on the basis of this book.

Professor Dr Gabor Orban, the society's chairman, called the constituent assembly to order. After his inaugural address, the next speaker was Ivan Derer, the minister of education. In his Hungarian speech he dwelt on the significance of the society's formation, "from the viewpoint of the local Hungarians as well as of the Czechoslovak Republic."

The Masaryk Academy's organizing committee had invited many Hungarian cultural institutions and personalities to the constituent assembly, but nobody came. Some--for example, the Kisfaludy Society, the Hungarian Writers' Union, the editors of MAGYAR NYELVOR (Hungarian Language Guardian), the rector of Szeged University, and writer Pal Simandy who had returned recently to Hungary from his emigration in Lucenec--greeted the constituent assembly by telegram. Of the Czech and Slovak institutions, the Czech Academy of Sciences and Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava, the Safarik Society, etc. sent greetings.

Among the newspapers and periodicals of different political persuasions, extensive debate developed on the activity and tasks of the Masaryk Academy. The literary journal UJ MUNKA (New Work), which folded after the first issue, proposed a questionnaire survey so that, in addition to the politicians, also those who were the most directly interested could have their say about the Masaryk Academy: writers, scientists, and various representatives of the intellectuals. Within the questionnaire survey, not only Czechoslovak writers were requested to respond, but the opinions were sought also of several writers in Hungary. Among the writers living in Budapest, Mihaly Babits, Zsigmond Moricz, Dezso Kosztolanyi, Aladar Komlos and Jenő Mohácsi responded. Zsigmond Moricz called President Masaryk's million korunas a "princely gift." Aladar Komlos, the writer and critic who had been born in Lucenec, recommended a publishing house for Hungarian books, and starting a literary journal of high standards.

Noteworthy among the Czechs was the statement by Prague university professor Emanuel Radl. This eminent Czech scientist had viewed the situation of the Hungarian minority realistically and free of chauvinism already earlier, and he was the first to propose that Czechoslovakia's Hungarian writers and poets, too, should be eligible for the literary prizes awarded annually. His opinion of the Masaryk Academy was that it ought to become a modern institution "that pursues science for the sake of the people, the Hungarian minority, and serves the historical needs of the era." He added that the new academy "must serve as a substitute for the Hungarian university that is lacking."

Special mention must be made of Zoltan Fabry's opinion, then and later, regarding the academy and Masaryk. True to his sectarian-dogmatic period at that

time (which cannot be divorced from the sectarianism of the communist parties of that period), Fabry said of the academy: "In view of the fact that the Masaryk foundation is entirely a cause of bourgeois-capitalist class culture, I have nothing to do with it." Two decades had to pass for Fabry to admit his earlier mistake. He used the centennial of the birth of this exceptionally ethical person, Masaryk, as the occasion to correct his earlier prejudiced views. In an article in UJ SZO (No 56, 1950, p 3) entitled "As Hungarians Remember Masaryk," Fabry wrote: "We shrug off his gesture, were suspicious, hissed and excommunicated: the Masaryk Academy was a bourgeois cultural cause and had nothing to do with us! We were unjust, intolerant and cruel, because Masaryk was more than bourgeois culture summarily, and different than the cause of the Masaryk Academy expropriated by the Agrarians and the Social Democrats. In our great haste we threw out with the bathwater also the baby, the legacy that must not be squandered, the humane."

Fabry derives from Masaryk's humanism the "vox humana" for the Hungarians in Slovakia. Although the one million Hungarians found the new state, including Masaryk, difficult to bear. As Fabry notes, "In our sensitivity close to tears, in our stubborn resentment and hopeless forlornness, his was the first voice that reconciled us to the new situation."

When the greatest writer of the Hungarians in Slovakia, and their living conscience in times of crisis, professes the Masaryk experience of the Hungarian minority, also other Hungarian writers in Slovakia between the two world wars confirm the profound truth of Fabry's following words: "I contend that the Masaryk experience of Hungarian youths was more decisive and determining than for the large mass of Slovak youths."

We have to agree with Fabry also in that "the many sins of the Masaryk era cannot be blamed simply on Masaryk himself." All this does not mean that Fabry, if only in retrospect, agrees with the social outlook and anticommunist ideology of Masaryk who represented the bourgeois ideals of the turn of the century. On the other hand, Fabry declares: "Even though we may have serious reservations regarding Masaryk's philosophy and sociology, one thing we have to admit: here and then, his was the voice of humanism."

In sum and with simplification, but very aptly, Fabry notes: "Masaryk was not Benes!" His article (it was published in 1950!) attests to great moral courage. It ends with the following words, expressed in behalf of practically all Hungarians in Slovakia: "One cannot forget the wreath on the Strekov grave. On this centennial we have merely written a receipt for the vox humana. Nothing more, nothing less."

The picture presented of the Masaryk Academy would be incomplete if we were to write only about its reception and the response to its establishment, but nothing about the society's activity. The public experienced its first disappointment when the government placed the institution to be established in the hands of Hungarian representatives of the two governing parties, the Agrarians and the Social Democrats. Exercising its right of appointment, the government chose a large proportion of the society's officers from among proven "activists" (activists were the Hungarian politicians and intellectuals unconditionally loyal and servile to the government--K.V.). With their help, also the

individual departments were staffed with journalists of the governing parties "promoted to writers and scholars." Thus fruitful cultural activity could hardly be expected of the society. Dezso Gyory, the greatest Hungarian poet in Slovakia between the two world wars, justifiably calls the Masaryk Academy "a storehouse of missed opportunities" (MAGYAR UJSAG, No 132, 1933). The young Sarlo members, who had played an initiating role behind the idea during their audience with the president, protested the most definitely against the Masaryk Academy's "orientation on government policy and its dilettantism."

Masaryk's resignation from the presidency on 14 December 1935 had an unfavorable effect on the society's life. Although the Masaryk cult continued within the society, this alone was not sufficient to enable minority Hungarian scientific life to unfold within the walls of the academy. The generous gift of the Czechoslovak Republic's first president had merely provided the prerequisites for this. The modest results of the academy's activity are insignificant when compared with these possibilities. Due to its political division and petty personal bickering, the society's leadership was unable to utilize these possibilities. But all this does not detract anything from the humanist chief of state's gesture that remains unprecedented in the countries of central and eastern Europe.

Masaryk was able to depart from this life on 14 September 1937 in the belief that his life's work, the Czechoslovak Republic, was resting on a solid foundation, and that the bourgeois democratic system that had evolved over nearly two decades closely associated with his name would prove durable. The storm clouds threatening Masaryk's state began to gather over the republic only one year after the death of the president-liberator. The causes of the political crisis that rocked the very foundations of the state were primarily international ones: the crisis of the Versailles peace system. It turned out that failure to solve the nationality question, the frustrated Slovak national aspirations, and pressure exerted by Hitler's Germany split apart the multinational Czechoslovak Republic. The one-time British and French allies of Masaryk and Benes capitulated to Hitler and sacrificed Czechoslovakia in Munich. In emigration during World War II, Masaryk's successors--President Benes in particular--concluded from the historical events that it would be a mistake to restore the republic on the basis of Masaryk's principles. Benes and his group succeeded in gaining the Czechoslovak Communist Party's support for the deportation of the German and Hungarian minorities. Therefore the Kosice Program announced by Benes in April 1945 was able to include the collective disfranchisement of the German and Hungarian national minorities, which would then serve as the "legal" basis of further measures against the minorities. None of this stemmed from the principles of Masaryk's humanism.

Difficult and complicated tasks confronted the Czech Communists in their political struggles, also in relation to Masaryk. On the one hand it was necessary to recognize his merits in the struggle for democracy, and to respect the fact that wide masses regarded him as a symbol in defending national sovereignty and democracy. On the other hand the Communists were obliged to start out realistically from the fact that Masaryk had not been a socialist or Marxist, had often attacked communism sharply, had idealized capitalist social conditions, had not granted autonomy to Slovakia and Subcarpathian Russia, and had not attempted to change the balance of political power that had been detrimental to

the working class. For all these reasons, the Communists' attitude toward Masaryk was not limited merely to respect and recognition, but extended also to struggle against Masarykism. Particularly Klement Gottwald criticized Masaryk harshly, whereas Zdenek Nejedly and others, parallel with their criticism, were more inclined to recognize the humanist content of the democracy that indirectly had served also the interests of the working class. Among the latter, the much respected Professor Nejedly presented a high-level, Marxist critique of Masarykism, in three thick volumes, already during the president's lifetime. As Laszlo Dobossy points out in his work "Ket Haza Kozott" (Between Two Countries), it was typical of the president's "cultural liberalism" that Nejedly's critical tone toward Masaryk had not cost Nejedly his university chair!

In 1945-1950, the Communists waged a struggle not only against Masaryk's ideas, but simultaneously also for Masaryk, for the lastingly progressive in his work and intellectual legacy. In the meantime, the February 1948 revolution in Prague forced President Benes to resign, and he was succeeded by Klement Gottwald. After his election to the presidency, the general secretary of the Communist Party visited the grave at the castle in Lany to pay his respects, and this did not seem merely a tactical gesture. However, the first half of the 1950's left its mark also on the treatment of the Masaryk question. As dogmatism and sectarianism prevailed, harsh and even unjust criticism were directed against the first republic's first president. The publications that appeared in this period considered it their principal mission to free public opinion of the "legends" surrounding Masaryk's person, and of alleged false notions. There were some who went even further, branding Masaryk as a pharisee, and his humanism as a historical lie. Certain authors used the sectarian period's typical attributes when referring to Masaryk. Thus Masaryk was "financial capital's political captain" who in Hradcany Castle was guided by the principles of "social fascism" rather than of democracy. Included in Masaryk's list of crimes was that he regarded the "democracy of the Anglo-Saxon imperialist system" as an example to be followed, and that he had "americanized" entire Czechoslovak life. According to these criticisms, Masaryk "was not a progressive and his period was reactionary, because all along he spread a bourgeois ideology and held sociopolitical views that were counterrevolutionary by nature" (Jan Pacht, "Pravda o T. G. Masarykovi" ((The Truth About T. G. Masaryk)), Prague, 1953, p 39).

The tone used in discussing President Masaryk began to change only after the 20th CPSU Congress, and the publications since then are suggesting the start of a new Masaryk cult. According to such prominent authors as Milan Machovec, communist humanism and socialist democracy have their roots also in Masaryk's life work. Thus his significance that embraces social systems has outgrown the framework of his state and nation. In the period of World War I and during the two decades between the two world wars, he was a history-shaping factor unmatched by anyone else here in central and southeastern Europe during the first third of the 20th century.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Masaryk, T. G., "Ceska Otazka" (The Czech Question), Prague, 1895. New edition, 1924.

2. Masaryk, T. G., "Karel Havlicek," Prague, 1896.
3. Masaryk, T. G., "Jan Hus," Prague, 1923.
4. Masaryk, T. G., "Rusko a Evropa" (Russia and Europe), Prague, 1913-1914.
5. Masaryk, T. G., "Nova Evropa" (The New Europe), Hungarian edition, Kosice, 1923.
6. Masaryk, T. G., "Politikai Gondolatok" (Thoughts on Politics), Bratislava, 1935.
7. Masaryk, T. G., "A Nemzetiségi Kérdés" (The Nationality Problem), Bratislava, 1935.
8. Masaryk, T. G., "A Modern Ember és a Vallás" (Modern Man and Religion), Bratislava, 1935.
9. Masaryk, T. G., "Erkölcsi Problema" (Ethical Problems), Bratislava, 1935.
10. Masaryk, T. G., "Az Antisemitizmus" (Antisemitism), Bratislava, 1935.
11. "Masaryk T. G. Élete, Munkássága és Hatása" (T. G. Masaryk's Life, Activity and Influence), Bratislava, 1930.
12. Capek, Karel, "Beszélgetések Masaryk Garrigue Tamással" (Conversations With T. G. Masaryk), 3 volumes, Mukacevo, 1933-1935.
13. Nejedlý, Zdeněk, "T. G. Masaryk," 3 volumes, Prague, 1930-1937.
14. Krizek, Jan, "T. G. Masaryk" and "T. G. Masaryk a Česká Politika (T. G. Masaryk and Czech Politics), Prague, 1959.
15. "O Protidávné a Protinárodní Činnosti T. G. Masaryka" (About the Antipopular and Antinational Activity of T. G. Masaryk), Prague, 1953. Hungarian edition: "Okmányok T. G. Masaryk Népi és Nemzetellenes Politikájáról" (Documents on T. G. Masaryk's Antipopular and Antinational Policies), Bratislava, 1954.
16. Pachta, Jan, "Pravda o T. G. Masarykovi" (The Truth About T. G. Masaryk), Prague, 1953.
16. Machovec, Milan, "T. G. Masaryk," Prague, 1968.
17. "Masaryk na Slovensku" (Masaryk in Slovakia), Bratislava, 1935.
18. Balint, Miklós, "Masaryk Élete" (Masaryk's Biography), Užhorod, 1928.
19. Kovács, Endre, "Történelmi Arcképek. Masaryk" (Historical Profiles. Masaryk), Budapest, 1976.
20. Dobossy, László, "Két Hazá Között" (Between Two Countries), Budapest, 1981.

21. Kovago, Laszlo, "Jegyzetek T. G. Masaryk Europa Ujjaszervezesi Terverol. Tanulmányok Kelet-Europa Történetéből" (Notes on T. G. Masaryk's Plan for the Reorganization of Europe. Studies on East European History), 2 volumes, Budapest, 1972, lithographed, pp 181-204.
22. Popely, Gyula, "A Csehszlovákiai Magyar Tudományos, Irodalmi és Képzőművészeti Társaság" (The Czechoslovak Hungarian Society for Science, Literature and the Fine Arts), Bratislava, 1973.
23. Fabry, Zoltan, "As Hungarians Remember Masaryk," UJ SZO, No 56, 1950.
24. Szalatnai, Rezso, "Lajos Scherer and MI LAPUNK," IRODALMI SZEMLE, No 3, 1969.

1014

CSO: 2500/435

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

BRIEFS

JABLONSKI RECEIVES BULGARIAN ENVOY--The Chairman of the State Council, Henryk Jablonski, received today in audience in the Belweder ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the People's Republic of Bulgaria Georgi Georgiev, who presented his letters of credence. The Bulgarian ambassador was later received in private audience. [Text] [LD051834  
Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1600 GMT 5 Sep 83]

CSO: 2600/1308



## BULGARIA

### TANZANIAN PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION ARRIVES 13 SEPTEMBER

Met by Todorov

AU131921 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 1730 GMT 12 Sep 83

[Text] On 13 September a Tanzanian parliamentary delegation led by Adam Sapi Mkwawa, National Assembly chairman, arrived in Bulgaria. The Tanzanian delegation will have talks at the National Assembly and visit industrial and agrarian enterprises in Sofia and the country, as well as historical and cultural monuments.

At Sofia airport the delegation was greeted by Stanko Todorov, National Assembly chairman, and by other officials.

Talks Begin

AU141527 Sofia BTA in English 1445 GMT 14 Sep 83

[Text] Sofia, 14 Sep (BTA)--A delegation of the National Assembly of Tanzania, headed by its speaker, Mr Adam Sapi Mkwawa, arrived on a visit here yesterday. The visit marks the outset of the parliamentary contacts between Bulgaria and Tanzania.

This morning the guests had talks with a delegation of the Bulgarian National Assembly, led by its chairman, Mr Stanko Todorov.

Voiced was the common confidence that the cooperation between the two countries is very good in all spheres, that the establishment of parliamentary contacts will be a contribution to the further development of Bulgaro-Tanzanian relations.

Mr Adam Sapi Mkwawa thanked Bulgaria for her help rendered to Tanzania in the development of her economy.

Mr Stanko Todorov assured the Tanzanian parliamentarists that Bulgaria has always been and will remain on the side of the peoples who fight for their national independence and social progress.

He also underlined that Bulgaria highly values Tanzania's policy, aimed at the safeguarding of the world peace, and the active role of President Julius Nyerere in the non-aligned movement.

#### Zhivkov Receives Delegation

AU151048 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 0800 GMT 15 Sep 83

[Text] Todor Zhivkov, secretary general of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the State Council, received the visiting parliamentary delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania, headed by Adam Sapi Mkwawa, speaker of the Tanzanian National Assembly.

Comrade Todor Zhivkov briefed the guests on Bulgaria's successes in various sectors of economy and agriculture. He told them about the tasks that our people are accomplishing in building a developed socialist society.

Stanko Todorov, chairman of the Bulgarian National Assembly, attended the meeting, which proceeded in a friendly atmosphere.

CSO: 2200/147

BULGARIA

AGRARIAN UNION OFFICIAL VISITS SWEDEN, DENMARK

AU131100 Sofia BTA in English 0855 GMT 13 Sep 83

[Text] Copenhagen, 13 Sep (BTA)--Mr Pando Vanchev, member of the standing committee of the Bulgarian Agrarian Union, minister of communications of Bulgaria, was on a visit to Sweden and Denmark where he had meetings with political and public figures and with representatives of the business circles.

In Stockholm he was received by Mr (Gunar Hedlund), honorary chairman of the Center Party in Sweden. The two parties' wish was expressed to further develop their traditional relations which contribute to the mutually advantageous cooperation between the two countries and to the cause of peace and understanding. Stress was laid on the positive role the setting up of nuclear-free zones in Europe would have.

Mr Pando Vanchev met also Mrs Carin Soder [name as received], first deputy-chairman of the Center Party.

In Denmark Mr Pando Vanchev was received by the leadership of the Radical Venster Party [Radical Liberal Party], headed by its chairman, Mr Thorkild Moller. They had talks on the further development of the friendly relations which have been maintained for many years now between the Bulgarian Agrarian Union and the Venster Party.

In the talks in Stockholm and Copenhagen wch was expressed for the Bulgarian Agrarian Union, the Center Party in Sweden and the Radical Venster Party in Denmark to contribute to the successful proceeding of the forthcoming second conference of the peasants' and kindred democratic parties and organizations, parties of the center, leftwing, radical and liberal parties and organizations which will be an important contribution to the struggle for security and detente in Europe.

CSO: 2200/147

BULGARIA

VIETNAM NATIONAL HOLIDAY MARKED, ENVOY SPEAKS

AU031500 Sofia BTA in English 1330 GMT 3 Sep 83

[Text] Sofia, 3 Sep (BTA)--To mark the national day of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, a solemn meeting was held last night in the city of Burgas, which was attended by leaders of the city and the county, many citizens and Vietnamese workers trained there.

The secretary of the county committee of the Fatherland Front, Mr Georgi Milev spoke in his speech about the strong ties of fraternal and fruitful cooperation between the Bulgarian and the Vietnamese people, a cooperation resting upon the foundations of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism. Bulgaria and Vietnam maintain very active links of cooperation in all spheres of life. Bulgarian technical aid has been injected into the construction in Vietnam of scores of complete projects, such as electric power stations, fodder plants, freezing houses and poultry farms.

A speech at the meeting was delivered also by the ambassador of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in Bulgaria. He expressed gratitude for the fraternal aid of the Bulgarian Communist Party, the Government and the Bulgarian people in the struggle of the Vietnamese people for liberation, national independence and unification and in the socialist construction.

The Vietnamese ambassador read a speech also over the Bulgarian radio and television. He stressed that the people of Vietnam have no other more ardent wish than that to live in peace, and that Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea should cope with the serious threat looming over peace and stability in Indochina and Southeast Asia. "We" he said, "together with the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, with the nonaligned countries and the peaceloving forces in the world are fighting resolutely for the strengthening of peace and against the arms race. We strongly condemn the belligerent attempts of the American imperialism and NATO, we fully back the peace initiatives contained in the Prague political declaration of the Warsaw Treaty states, and the latest proposals of the Soviet Union for nuclear disarmament."

In connection with the national day, the Sofia dailies came out with various materials dedicated to the new life of the Vietnamese people. They have reported, among other things, that in implementation of the

agreement signed in 1980 between the two governments, at present more than 10,000 Vietnamese girls and boys are staying in Bulgaria for vocational education and training. They are studying in various educational and vocational centers and various industries, and after graduation immediately go to practice. Guided by Bulgarian specialists, they grow up as qualified cadres. Still others graduate from the Bulgarian higher educational establishments and after a couple of years' work in their homeland, they come again to Bulgaria to improve their qualifications. Among them are civil engineers, technical chiefs and technologists.

All the Vietnamese in Bulgaria are surrounded with the care and attention of their colleagues at the place of work. They live in workers' hostels.

CSO: 2200/146

## BULGARIA

### BRIEFS

NEW JORDANIAN AMBASSADOR--Sofia, 14 Sep (BTA)--"The development of relations between Bulgaria and Jordan has a good basis and prospects. Bulgaria is ready to continue to develop them on mutually advantageous principles. We are convinced that this will be to the benefit of both peoples," said today Mr Todor Zhivkov, president of the State Council when Mr Walid al-Sa'di, Jordan's newly appointed ambassador to Bulgaria presented his credentials to him. He said that an international conference with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the PLO--the sole legal representative of the people of Palestine--is necessary to be convened for the settlement of the Middle East issue. Mr Walid al-Sa'di said that in all spheres Bulgaria and Jordan's relations have been built on principles of friendship based on sincerity and mutual respect. [Text] [AU141536 Sofia BTA in English 1455 GMT 15 Sep 83]

CSO: 2200/147

REPORT, CRITIQUE OF GUIDED TOUR, DAILY LIFE

West Berlin DIE TAGESZEITUNG in German 24 Aug 83 p 9

[Article by Hermann Strahl, Dortmund: "A Week of Real Socialism"]

[Text] With the SDAJ into the GDR, okay, but for 100 marks including accommodation and food and without mandatory currency exchange for 9 days in that German state about which the right wing keeps pestering you but that one cannot get away from and, above all, cannot form a proper picture of. When it turns out at the Dortmund railroad station that only the "head of the delegation" belongs to the SDAJ and the other 15 participants have joined the group via the Kamen city youth ring and form a sundry spectrum from the center to various leftist groups, initial tension relaxes.

It is foggy and dark when we cross the border without any problems. The bunch of customs officials, border guards and the conductors with their insignias (making it hard for militarily unschooled eyes to identify the uniforms) confine themselves to amicably confiscating daily newspapers left lying around. To travel as an SDAJ delegation sure was of advantage here.

The first native travelers boarding our train are lively and frank, as we were to find time and again in our loose contacts with the population. "No one is starving here--but meat, butter, sugar, coffee, spare parts . . .," always again anger about the bureaucrats and examples for how they have been taken for a ride.

Did Mies Send You?

Soccer fans, who are not wearing their black-yellow pennants, however, are the first all-German impression at the Leipzig railroad station. At the Mitropa restaurant our FDJ escorts serve us plates overcrowded with sausage--not for the last time, at that. While we cautiously and courteously smell each other out, the train continues to Grimma, population 17,000 and a kreis town, where we are going to be quartered. On the way, always again questions from fellow travelers: "Did Mies send you?" When we indicate what we think of that figure and that we are no promoters for our bosses, things relax and stories about normal German life are sprouting forth.

Grimma is the first GDR town we come through. Many red flags and many black-red-gold ones with the GDR emblem--that is the most colorful. The slogans on banners exhibiting stereotyped phrases harmoniously suit the run down yellowing house facades. Back home we know such panoramas from black and white films of the early 1950's. But the old city hall has been neatly restored and restructured into a house of culture with disco and restaurant. Again abundantly set tables await us there.

After lunch the program starts. GDR history, told by a veteran. Much of interest right at the outset. The smashing of fascism from the outside; the escape of many specialists, teachers and engineers, and farmers and technicians; separation from the old economic region. That did provide many mitigating circumstances for difficulties and mistakes, "yet 37 years later, we surely should like to see a bit more socialism of the Marxist-Leninist kind or of the sort we have imagined--in terms of the all-round developed democracy, the developed personalities, the self-determination of the enterprises . . .," that is what we inquired about. The stereotype reply would follow us through every discussion with functionaries: "The class enemy is not asleep, the old Adam keeps breaking through again and again even in the GDR, you are making all too much of minor contradictions, all this serves the construction of socialism and is therefore good and sound." After half an hour of debate in the kreis, some can no longer take it. Others still have missionary sentiments along with it, we are giving some tips for a little more daring toward democracy and, being subject to job restrictions at home, are appealing for our fellow-sufferers over there, in trying to remind the GDR of the sloganry in its own claims. With a courteous, quiet shrug of their shoulders they either will not or cannot understand us.

While looking for a lantern procession in preparation for the 33th birthday of the republic, we are running into two members of the Red Cross in dark Grimma who have just come from a maneuver exercise in the neighboring town of Colditz. After a brief warmup with us, it gushes out of them. "When you join nothing, you have no chance at all. In the Red Cross you can at least help people sometimes directly. But normally you have to enter the enterprise militias of the 'Society for Sport and Technology.' At the Colditz maneuvers someone had written on a window pane in large letters: 'For which war are we practicing here?' At once they grabbed all the packs, the People's Police and state security closed off everything, but they found nothing." In talking to us, their mischievous joy breaks into open laughs. You lose track of that again when you hear all these dismal stories about normal life.

Back to the program where now the head of the FDJ bezirk school treats us to half an hour of platitudes about the FDJ Peace Effort: "Refuse utilization by the FDJ strengthens the GDR economy, that is peace. Discipline on the job strengthens the GDR, that is peace. More volunteers in the people's army strengthen . . ., that is peace." No one could then think of any more questions.

Around 2200 hours a bus picks us up to take us to overnight accommodations in neat surroundings, remote from any possible contact with people. That there is method to this quarantine location is something our hosts deny, but it fully matches the picture. On Sunday morning a little leisure in real socialism--mixed impressions: the local river, the Mulde, has tipped over, the town's park quite pretty, the coffee machine in the restaurant much too small, the



chairs on tight chains, sunshine on the autumnal forest, and the GDR citizens are patiently queuing up for an empty table for dinner. For us there is a reservation, of course, and after dinner a retired lieutenant colonel has a peace debate in store for us. Alter the signs and this elderly officer might have been recruiting for the FRG Army or the Reichswehr even. The arms race, bigger and better medals, Prussian traditions in uniform and goose-step--well, all this is necessary to secure peace. The same old yarn, and some of us quit the debate in frustration. Those who remain are clinching their teeth until the chauffeur of the lieutenant colonel reminds him of another scheduled assignment.

After the evening meal, culture with circa 15 selected pupils in the high school. The music teacher plays the piano accompaniment for five girls singing Nicole-like songs of the workers movement and creations of their own: "I love the shining red, the red of paprika, cheeks, lips, lovers, blossoms, cherries, tomatoes, poppy, flags and revolution." A fit of laughter I am breaking into suddenly is a futile attempt my mind is making to digest all such nonsense. In the school's FDJ club--a waiting room with flowery wall paper which is loosened up by a picture of Honecker--the program calls for casual conversation. When higher functionaries are present, things always become casual. It helps to smoke cigarettes together in the yard as otherwise smoking is forbidden. In our first preparatory session they took us as an SDAJ group to be given easy treatment. Then after our initial appearances there must have been a special preparatory session where the pupils were readied for opportunists under petty bourgeois influence from whom one could not expect very much. Anyone who plans to study, especially something attractive like medicine or law, not only needs good grades but, more so, a societal rating: FDJ cadre work, volunteering for military service for 3 years, and an opportunistic devotion to assignments are the foundation for advancement opportunities. A silly mistake, e.g. in talking with us, may wreck all real socialist dreams.

Creepy it was how we were sneaking back to the bus through the Wilhelminian hallways from the walls of which, along with the ubiquitous Honecker, all sorts of other hit parade models were grinning at us with their young cadre smirks.

Monday morning at leisure in Leipzig. This metropolis at the first glance has something ugly the all-German way. The people in the streets are more approachable. Incidentally, we are hardly being recognized as Westerners. They no longer make much about average fashions, jeans and parkas and the small extras, all the same. They had tipped us off secretly to books before. We buy what we can carry in cheap and excellent second-hand book stores, and we notice there are as many salesmen there as customers--mainly pensioners who that way enhance their low pensions. The other secret tip, wooden toys and other craft items, we find later back home available at Plus, while in the stores over there, mainly plastic junk. If something good goes onto the shelves, the population buys it up. Along with western money, natural barter, goods against goods, has come to the forefront again in the most progressive state on German soil. We also see queues outside of bakeries and butcher shops, but by no means to the extent as in Poland. With winter coming, there is general fear of supply bottlenecks, though.

After lunch we do learn a thing or two about housing problems from a rather frank urban planner. By 1990 that is supposed to be resolved quantitatively so that all families have an apartment. Even though by now we had diverse ideas about it, the group is now almost enthusiastic that it hears something about difficulties.

In the evening three of us kept away from the program. We had become acquainted with people who do not exist in the GDR. Two young people looking for a job in the commonwealth, muddling through as unemployed right now. Stemming from families strongly supportive of the republic, they no longer could or wanted to suppress their dropping out and now they moved in one of the sub-scenes in Leipzig. Without any clear political proclivity but with pervasive hatred for everything in this all-inclusive apparatus of bureaucrats with its empty sloganry. In their private apartments they are listening to western records from the Stones to tapes and talk, holler and drink a lot; and these miniature structures do lend a sense of fellowship and a bit of strength for survival. Through special laws against "asocial conduct" such persons who refuse to work can be forced to work or be put into jail. Barred from traveling even within the GDR, compulsory registration and threatening rearrest then become the real socialist means of persuasion. What we learned there and elsewhere is hard to report but can well be felt when one has spent a few days under normal GDR conditions.

On Tuesday via Weimar to Buchenwald. Ambivalent feelings about this antifascist tourism where the dismay with the fascist horror is in the most primitive way used to justify the system. The frivolous gaiety in the various FDJ groups and school grades inspecting the concentration camp with us demonstrate the limitation of this kind of history instruction.

Wednesday then became the nicest day. We inspected an enterprise, the Grimma chemical installation combine. Having a work force of circa 4,000, it is as large as the machine construction enterprise that uses my labor at home. We can talk with some workers directly (which as a rule is forbidden in FRG enterprises). There is hardly any difference in the technical level. In some respects they are farther ahead; there are even some robots developed for enterprise tasks as such. They replace the most monotonous and strenuous operations, which the workers proudly talk to us about. That they operate three shifts is understood in GDR enterprises operating on a high technical level--the capital invested has to be used. By the way we find out that it is customary to take the 6 weeks of sickleave per year, fully paid. That is hardly reduced even by the hospitalization charts through which the departments of the various brigades (comparable to our task forces) compete with one another. In spite of what they insist on officially, their dependence on the world market is in full effect, by the way. Workers are telling us that because of shortages of commissions or in material many enterprises operate less and less.

The apprentice dormitory of the enterprise looked typically sterile, outside and inside. Only when they had two or three beds in their rooms were the young people allowed to give free rein to the imagination on the walls. Small medieval pictures in the communal halls document the dormitory management's ties with youth. It makes us wince to be informed that the cleanest rooms get a monthly monetary bonus while disorder results in being deprived of the infrequent permission to go out at night.

In the enterprise guest house, a neatly reconditioned mill, there are then debates in small circles while much meat is served buffet-style plus disco. To us this is the most relaxed evening in the republic. Relaxation is the main trend, but not only because of the alcohol. The operational cadre got some fresh supply. German kinship and fraternization scenes, with the Stones, bring the evening to a close.

But right thereafter, the following morning, by a town official in charge of democracy the mood was put back in line. He babbled platitudes about the developed socialist democracy like a cassette recorder with its setting broken off. He ordered a timid female town deputy to corroborate all he said. Another functionary then gave me some private tutoring in real socialist democracy. In the FDJ history of Grimma Kreis for secretarial elections (something like board elections) there always only were as many candidates as vacancies, and they would not even debate the persons to be elected; candidates were always recommended by the top leadership, of course. Even so there have been election results below 100 percent. When questioned more closely, some blockhead cadre would admit it: "It shows how fully we agree!" FDJ functionaries, incidentally, make a good living, and even social privileges like foreign travel, especially to the West, accrue to them. So you want to be careful in saying something frankly, critically. They also have been sending cadre to prove themselves into production. Work, particularly physical work, is also punishment in the first workers state on German soil.

In the autumnal sunshine of the last day of the program we go to the model LPG of the kreis. Faults are not being concealed in their reports and their answers to our questions. They show us spots where the beets remained small and talk about overfertilization in recent years and other acts of despoiling nature. Here we feel comfortable at once. One senses what it can mean to be a self-assured cooperative, especially also when not everything is top-notch. But this was the model LPG in the kreis, and sabotage against the bureaucracy seems to be nowhere as easy as in agriculture.

In the afternoon in the polytechnical general school children welcome us with flowers and peace songs. But walking through the school we again run into what we could expect. In every classroom and hallway the lists of the best pupils--all that is missing on the john is a list of the best shitheads. But sometimes a slip saying something like "Peter and Guenter again have not gathered enough beechnuts; we shall see to it that they do better!" Flowers and pictures in the classrooms, to be sure, but not a scent of anyone's own initiative. Standard subjects presented in a streamlined fashion, and the fewest mistakes are made when one cuts something out of NEUES DEUTSCHLAND. Female tutors take charge of the lower grades in the afternoon. We enter a classroom where the pupils are quietly watching a fellow who is rummaging in his satchel. "You again it is, Ede, who cannot find his notebook," his teacher hisses. But then he did find it after all, and a girl posted in front of the class reports in soldier fashion: "Class xyz all ready for homework!" This picture matches the twisting and turning of a school inspector type of functionary: "There has to be order, after all; pedagogic measures like putting pupils in the pillory have never yet done anyone any harm, which is of course a voluntary matter when the pupils are hundred percent young pioneers." Gobbledygook. It did not even sit right with our SDAJ tourist guide. Streamlined uniform teachers are smoothing down streamlined uniform pupils. Marx' idea of the all-round developed personality in socialism comes down to chopsticks here.

So it went. And then came the last evening with the wrap-up in the presence of the FDJ bezirk secretary. In jingles we submitted some more cryptic criticism. Though our approaches differed, we once again went over a matter or two. A helplessly friendly lack of understanding and thanks for our many suggestions were

what we got in return. Then the evening went by with Saxonian beer, which is really good.

Returning home on Saturday. After passing the border the urge overcomes us to let ourselves go once again, and good; and it does us a lot of good.

5885.

CSO: 2300/393

POLAND

GLEMP CONDEMNS ETHICAL 'IRREGULARITIES' IN APPROACH TO ACCORDS

LD052357 Vatican City in Polish to Poland 1800 GMT 5 Sep 83

[Excerpts] The primate of Poland, Cardinal Jozef Glemp, delivered a homily yesterday, Sunday, 4 September, at Jasna Gora during high mass for the all-Poland pilgrimage of farmers.

Thanks to the Lord for allowing us always to win in Christ. I recall these words of Saint Paul, which I quoted at the beginning and which permit us to look through the eyes of faith at the history of the homeland during the period of Jan Sobieski. In addition, they are to facilitate for us the assessment of contemporary events; those favorable, like thanksgiving for farm crops and thanksgiving for the second pilgrimage of the Holy Father; and those less favorable, like the continuing perplexity and bitterness in the hearts of many Poles.

I would like to touch here on the painful problem of social contracts, that is, the August accords of 3 years ago. The argument concerning their implementation constitutes a political problem and I will not touch this issue. But the August accords have their ethical dimension and the Church cannot be indifferent to the observance or nonobservance of moral principles, above all in the social domain.

Assuming the Church's concern for unity and peace in the homeland, I would like to draw attention to some irregularities in the ethical approach to the accords. The first ethical reservation emerges from the universally accepted formula that August, that in the accords there were no winners and losers. The issue was simply given priority over the prestige of the parties. Meanwhile, 3 years later, one can only hear the voices of the winners. The beaten one, partner of those crossed off the list, deserves only condemnation. He has neither the right nor the opportunity to say anything in his defense. And should he say something, he will be ridiculed, since it is not possible for a worker to enter the lists against a professional polemicist.

Thus the onesidedness of the public verdict, as the ancient Romans used to say: *audiator et altera pars* [let the other side also be heard] constitutes this ethical irregularity and often arouses unpleasant reactions, like impolite booing and shouting.

As the second ethical principle, the primate continued, I consider respect for the human being, even if he is the enemy. I remind you of this principle when the trade union movement experienced the peak of its euphoria, and I recall it now when the euphoria is running riot with the winners. In the enemy, too, it is necessary to protect the human being and his dignity from the idea in it that one is combating. The injury is most tangible when a member of the intelligentsia offends the worker. The member of the intelligentsia will remain alone and the scorned worker has behind him thousands of his like, who feel this scorn painfully.

The third ethical observation is related to the assertions that the workers' protest of that August was justified. No one can deny this. The protest resounded throughout virtually every town, as the evil has set roots everywhere. Out of this protest were born the demands for renewal, repair, reform. Without the August protest of the people there would have been no renewal.

Thus the shipbuilders or workers from other factories are the authors and joint authors of the renewal and reform. Assuming that later they committed errors and were punished, it is impossible to deny their contribution to the renewal process, otherwise we would be facing a historical plagiarism, and every plagiarism is unethical. Once again it has become apparent how very necessary a dialogue is between the authorities and the community, not just with selected groups, or groups met accidentally, but with the whole people, which will find an organic subjectivity.

Dear people, here are a few observations on the present day in the homeland, reservations evoked by the picture of the difficult fate of the same homeland 300 years ago, as Sobieski's homeland and our Poland are the same Poland. The old days are finished. In the biography of Jan Sobieski nothing will change. Meanwhile, the living ones create the reality of the homeland, the reality of errors, victories, defeats and achievements. We believers desire to be able to thank the Lord for enabling us always to win in Christ, as only Christ transforms defeats into victories, and the downfalls and sins He forgives, turning us into God's heirs.

Here is Christ's victory in us, a victory of good over evil. We beg the Lady of Jasna Gora for the victory of love. We beg Her trustfully for farmers and the entire homeland. We want the one whom we recognize with Jan Kazimierz as our queen to assist in the renewal of our homeland in justice.

These were excerpts from the homily delivered by Primate Jozef Glemp yesterday, Sunday, 4 September, at Jasna Gora, during high mass for the all-Poland farmers' pilgrimage.

CSO: 2600/1306

POLAND

BRIEFS

BARCIKOWSKI VISITS SZCZECIN SHIPYARD--Kazimierz Barcikowski, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee of the PZPR, has visited the Adolf Warski Shipyard in Szczecin. In August 1980, he signed the Szczecin Agreements on behalf of the government delegation. Kazimierz Barcikowski visited the prefabrication and hull assembly units. At work posts he talked with shipyard workers about welfare issues and their living conditions as well as the production situation at the enterprise. He met party activists and the K2 unit employees, where he is a member of the party organization. Representatives of the trade unions at the shipyard, workers' self-management and youth organizations took part in the discussion. The socio-political situation in the country, welfare issues, living conditions and the shipyard's production prospects were discussed. [Text] [LD100403 Warsaw Domestic Television Service in Polish 1730 GMT 9 Sep 83]

OLSZOWSKI MEETS SWEDISH MINISTER--In the Spanish capital, Minister Stefan Olszowski had talks with Lennart Bodstrom, foreign minister of Sweden. Satisfaction was expressed that the Madrid conference ended successfully, and the decision to convene the conference on means of building confidence and security and on disarmament in Stockholm next January was noted. The intention to cooperate in preparations for the conference was expressed. Bilateral relations were also discussed. [Text] [LD091844 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1600 GMT 9 Sep 83]

CSO: 2600/1309

AGACHI ADDRESSES FESTIVE MEETING ON DPRK HOLIDAY

AU081941 Bucharest AGERPRES in English 1830 GMT 8 Sep 83

[Text] Bucharest, AGERPRES 8/9/1983--A festive meeting was held in Bucharest on September 8 to celebrate the 35th anniversary of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The meeting was attended by Miu Dobrescu, alternate member of the Executive Political Committee, secretary of the CC of the RCP, Gheorghe Petrescu, deputy prime minister, Mihai Nicolae, deputy head of section at the CC of the RCP, by executives of ministries, mass and public organizations, and by working people from Bucharest enterprises and institutions.

Also attending were Sin In-ha, ambassador of the DPR of Korea in Bucharest, members of the embassy, as well as a delegation of the Korea-Romania Association of Friendship, led by Yun Sa, minister of labour, chairman of the association [name and title as received].

Neculai Agachi, minister of the metallurgical industry, chairman of the Romania-Korea Association of Friendship, spoke about the signification of the event.

The speaker pointed out that during its 35 years of existence, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea scored remarkable achievements and successes in the socialist revolution and in construction in the vast effort to industrialize the country and transform agriculture on new bases, in fulfilling the economic plans, in developing science, education, culture, in raising the working people's material and spiritual welfare.

As close friends, the Communists, the working people in Romania follow with keen interest and profound admiration the creative efforts, the firmness with which the Korean people works, under the leadership of the Workers' Party of Korea, at head with Kim Il-song, for the country's socio-economic development and sincerely rejoice at the remarkable successes it scores in implementing the resolutions of the sixth congress of the party, in building socialism.

Showing next that the RCP and the Romanian people have always manifested their full solidarity with and active support to the Korean people's struggle for the attainment of its vital aspiration after national unity,



the speaker said: The Romanian Communist Party, Socialist Romania, President Nicolae Ceausescu have actively supported the constructive initiatives and proposals of the Workers' Party of Korea, of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, of President Kim Il-song regarding the peaceful and independent reunification of Korea.

Showing that the festive meeting was an opportunity to express deep satisfaction at the long-standing relations of friendship, collaboration and militant solidarity between the Romanian Communist Party and the Workers' Party of Korea, between Romania and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the speaker highlighted the decisive role the meetings and talks between Presidents Nicolae Ceausescu and Kim Il-song played in the deepening of the friendly relations, in the steady consolidation of the Romanian-Korean collaboration. He referred then to the official visit of friendship President Nicolae Ceausescu and Elena Ceausescu paid to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea last April, to the productive results of the summit talks which made an important contribution to the further deepening and development of the friendship and collaboration between the two parties, states and peoples.

Sin In-ha, ambassador of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, also took the floor during the meetings.

CSO: 2020/71

ROMANIA

BRIEFS

GOVERNMENTAL APPOINTMENT--The president of the Socialist Republic of Romania decrees that Comrade Ion Ceausescu is appointed first vice chairman of the State Planning Committee, minister state secretary, member of the government and is relieved of his position as vice chairman of the State Planning Committee. [Excerpts] [Bucharest BULETINUL OFICIAL in Romanian Part I No 60, 1 Aug 83 p 6]

MINISTERIAL APPOINTMENT--The president of the Socialist Republic of Romania decrees that Comrade Constantin Tudor is relieved of his position as deputy minister of the machine building industry and Comrade Mihai Moraru is appointed deputy minister of the machine building industry. [Excerpts] [Bucharest BULETINUL OFICIAL in Romanian Part I No 59, 29 Jul 83 p 3]

PEOPLES COUNCIL APPOINTMENT--On the basis of Article 97 of Law No 57/1968 on the organization and operation of the peoples councils, the president of the Socialist Republic of Romania decrees that Comrade Gheorghe Oita is delegated to fill the position of first deputy chairman of the executive committee of the Olt County People's Council. [Excerpts] [Bucharest BULETINUL OFICIAL in Romanian Part I No 59, 29 Jul 83 p 3]

CSO: 2700/301

DR JOVAN DJORDJEVIC DISCUSSES SHORTCOMINGS IN LCY PROGRAM

Belgrade INTERVJU in Serbo-Croatian 24 Jun 83 pp 13-16

[Interview with Dr Jovan Djordjevic by Teodor Andjelic and Branislav Kovacic: "Great Ideas and Great Causes Require Great People"; date and place not specified]

[Text] In the new party history, which is in the process of being written collectively--each republic and province has its own commission--for 7 years now (the history will be ready for the press in November), disputes are mainly occurring over the small dates and not the major ones. One of the greatest ones, the 7th LCY Congress (22-26 April 1958), is causing the least misunderstandings among historians even today. Certain scholars, especially young ones, even call that congress "our best one." Although exactly a quarter century has elapsed since that time, this anniversary was observed rather modestly by the public, and possibly too modestly, if we recall that 25 years ago a document was adopted in Ljubljana--the third party program in succession--that has become the LCY's trademark in the eyes of the entire world.

Most of the chief creators of the program are no longer alive (Tito, Edvard Kardelj, Veljko Vlahovic, and Milentije Popovic). In the meantime Yugoslavia, like the entire world, has changed radically. Even certain Communist parties, which have today adopted a fair amount of our program took unexpectedly "harsh" positions on it at the time of its adoption.

(Here is just one example: Palmiro Togliatti, at a press conference on 14 May 1958, for example, said, "At the congress of the Yugoslav communists, things were said that we do not approve. Certain of their positions are so wrong that I cannot understand how the Yugoslav comrades could have formulated them. At any rate, I can tell you that there is full agreement on this in our party.")

Academician Jovan Djordjevic is one of those who participated in the creation of one of the most important parts of the program--the political system--and is one of these who have had an opportunity to "defend" it abroad. We therefore begin this conversation with the response the Program encountered in the world.

[Question] Immediately after the adoption of the Program, you delivered lectures in France and the United States. How was the LCY "case" received there?

[Answer] In private meetings and at numerous lectures, I was continually "called upon" to speak about the program. There was great interest in it and also in the entire case of Yugoslavia, particularly among student youth. Our new orientation with respect to the classic Stalinist model of socialism, and the program as a theoretical picture of this new socialism, aroused pleasure among all democratic forces in the world. It aroused interest, as an alternative to unpopular, dogmatic socialism always arouses interest.

[Question] Nevertheless, it gave rise to many reservations in the countries that today we call the countries of "real socialism." Even its draft, which was published in March--naturally it was considerably broader than the final version of the program--was criticized because of the alleged concept of "national communism" and "the program's objective orientation against the socialist countries, since under the banner of criticism of the blocs, it actually criticizes the unity of communist parties and the socialist camp..." Even the fact that it "received many compliments from bourgeois propaganda" was considered one of the main shortcomings of the program.

[Answer] Yes, there were such challenges. They were not theoretically formulated; for example, in the Soviet Union's leading journals there was not one critical synthesis of their critical comments.

To the extent that I can generalize their reasons for disagreement, these were primarily based on the fact that our program was an extremely unorthodox document. It differs from the program that was adopted by the Bolshevik party and the programs of the parties of the other socialist states in that the LCY Program is not just some short statutory document, but rather a vision of development fundamentally different from that of the USSR.

[Question] The public discussion of the program was short--just a month. How long did the work on the draft program last?

[Answer] A little over a year. The decision to create a new program was made by the Politburo, and by Comrade Tito, at the initiative of Comrade Kardelj. The final decision was made at the 7th Plenum of the LCY Central Committee, at the beginning of February 1957.

The work of the program was not particularly public before the publication of the program. It was known, however, that it was being prepared by a group gathered around Comrade Kardelj, who was and remained the chief author of the program.

I was invited at the start by Milos Minic to work on certain issues in the political system. Later I became involved in the work through Anton Vratusa, who was then Comrade Kardelj's chief of staff. I was only

one of numerous contributors, and that was on the political system, which is my specialty as a theoretician and a scholar.

[Question] Can you recall what your cooperation with Kardelj was like? What were his personal initiatives and ideas? How much did the Politburo keep track of the work, and how much did it intervene?

[Answer] Kardelj had his own system of work, which combined individual initiative and creativity with collective cooperation. Kardelj was a first-class theoretician. He always formulated his ideas in the form of general theses. Then he had individual people, who were invited and were closely interested in a given area, to develop them. Thus, from the general material that was completely within the framework of his theses, he compiled the whole and definitively formulated the text.

Kardelj avoided the kind of work in which everyone would have full freedom to say everything and whatever he liked. He felt that thought has to be responsible, within the framework of an ideological and political concept of thought. Since he was responsible for this thought, for the ideological direction, he gave his own views concrete form, allowing everyone, within the framework of these theses, to introduce his own new views and elements, to modify and improve. He was very tolerant.

[Question] What sort of role was played by Tito in the creation of the program?

[Answer] There is no doubt that not one idea expressed in the program was not influenced by Tito or agreed to by him. After all, the program was drawn up on the basis of a certain ideology, a certain way of thinking, that was common to the LCY. This fund of knowledge and this fund of ideas were nourished to a great extent by the ideas that Comrade Tito expressed and formulated for the first time during the revolution and after it, so that Tito, as an individual and as the head of the party, was incorporated into the fund of ideological and theoretical knowledge that served as the kernel of the program. Undoubtedly later in the course of the work Comrade Kardelj, who was a close collaborator of Comrade Tito, acquainted Tito with the positions. And Tito had opportunities to give his opinion when the Politburo was approving the draft Program, before it was presented before the Congress.

[Question] Who did the drafting?

[Answer] Kardelj.

[Question] Then Tito never attended the working meetings?

[Answer] It was done--and I think that this is a great advantage--in a way that is not the one that was later accepted in the Constitution and that is used today--by a commission. It was a way of uniting people who thought the same way, and who had the same views, around the person who was responsible for the work and allowed everyone to contribute, but on the basis of his own individual knowledge and individual work.

In fact, Kardelj synthesized all of this and assembled all the individual contributions, except that, as far as I know, he talked more often with Veljko Vlahovic and Milentije Popovic. They went over certain sensitive theoretical and political issues together. That was the working method.

[Question] Of the questions concerning the "authorship" of the program, the most interesting is certainly the moment at which it was adopted and its present value.

[Answer] That moment was a major turning point in the ideological and political development of Yugoslavia. The Program was the first great systematization of the nonaligned path and the democratic and independent development of Yugoslavia, a final and enduring commitment to self-management. This is its great significance for Yugoslavia and for the world as well.

At the time of the modest celebration of the anniversary of the program, the question of whether it is still relevant was brought up. Speaking theoretically, great historical documents that have meant the opening of a historical epoch are not for changing. They can be bypassed in individual positions, but their spirit, their basic theses, and their true values remain unchanged. This constitutes the value of great programs.

It did not occur to anyone in the communist movement to change the "Manifesto of the Communist Party." Any change in it would mean spoiling it, restricting its historic value. Although our program is naturally narrower than the Manifesto, more specific in substance, and less theoretical and programmatic than the Manifesto, I think that there is no basis for talking about changing the Program.

[Question] Does this mean that our program is actually a manifesto?

[Answer] Any ideological program is at the same time a manifesto. But it would be pretentious for us to call our program a manifesto, although it has elements of both. Nevertheless, there can be no serious change if there are no new mature ideas. Personally, I think that even though the program has been bypassed in certain formulations, as it has also been bypassed in certain practical commitments, we do not have today any radical innovation that would really force us to change it. Too little time has passed since the adoption of the program, and possibly there have not been either the conditions or the room for new ideas.

[Question] The political system deals with the issue of authority, the relationship between authority and society, the issue of human and civil freedom, and the issues of the internal order, federalism, and relations among nations. How consistent have we been in implementing the program's ideas on the political system?

[Answer] The question of abiding by the program is a long-term one. No text, no matter how wise it is, no matter how realistic or inspired, has ever been able to be fully implemented, nor will it always be possible to implement it.

Certain deviations are brought by life, practice, and these deviations are sometimes both better and more necessary than the theses contained in the program. They are also often weaker, however. I think that we have been most consistent in our commitment to an independent and autonomous Yugoslavia and a self-management political system. Our weakness is along the line of the socioeconomic and economic system, where we have not provided a comprehensive and rational system. I also think that there have not been enough opportunities for a democratic alternative to be realized, as the Program stipulated.

Every program is optimistic, and thus ours also did not foresee all the crises that we have experienced. One of the weaknesses is that the Program has not sufficiently inspired the leading forces in society to prevent a schism between theory and practice, between the program and reality, to prevent occurrences of certain doubts and even challenges that have occurred, with respect to a system that the program theoretically defined firmly and clearly.

[Question] When you prepared the Program, and especially the part on the theoretical system, you did not have any models. To some extent you have to create the visions, both theoretically and ideologically. To what extent was Marxism the inspiration for the Program?

[Answer] Marxism was one of the main inspirations, and it was the Marxism that in Yugoslavia has already begun to be freed from the dregs of traditional dogmatic thought. On the other hand, the party positions in various documents and in various situations were also inspirations. Finally, there is what applies to every creative work--a lively creative intelligence and intuition, which are the most important part of a creative act. Neither the young Marx nor the old one was copied. We thought critically.

[Question] What was the concept of federalism like then?

[Answer] Federalism had already become mature, with all of its contradictions, which will be resolved later on a different basis than is contained in the Program. The Program demonstrated federalism as the system of a community of equal and free peoples (the term nationalities was not used then; it was mentioned for the first time in the 1963 constitution). The Program proceeded on the basis that the Federation was a legacy of the revolution, i.e. that it was a given.

The question of relations between the federal units and the Federation, and the question of the superiority of the whole or the parts, were left for a later constitution. The Program, if I may generalize, had in mind a more unified, less decentralized, and more united community than appeared later in the constitution and in present-day reality.

[Question] Self-management has become the basis of the political system. Was this a sort of rehabilitation of the concept of the "withering away of the state"?

[Answer] Self-management is the principle of a state that is withering away. The term "withering away of the state" was used much more before the adoption of the Program, since then the main question was how the state would be "pushed out" out the process of governing over "everything and everyone" and be put in its proper place. Nevertheless, when the Program has been drawn up, when one thinks theoretically cleanly and systematically--and the Program expresses this--then any insistence on the withering away of the state can resurrect certain anarchistic ideas.

It was not as essential for the state to wither away as it was for it to be transformed and find its proper place in the process of building a socialist self-managing society. The Program thus made the idea of withering away a relative one, not in the sense of denying it, but also not in the sense of making it an absolute, as had been the case earlier.

[Question] At that time, how did you assess the legacies of the democratic parliamentary countries?

[Answer] The Program did not go into those questions. It expressed its own system, and not polemics, either with the Western or the Eastern model. I think the Program took into account everything that is the heritage of progressive thought. Thus, the positions on constitutionality and legality, which are reflected in Western democratic systems, were accepted as a characteristic of the political system of Yugoslavia. Since the Program avoided polemical intonations, it did not go into measuring and contrasting our system to the other models, but left it to the future to demonstrate this assessment and measurement.

[Question] The program contains the famous sentence that science has to be its own judge. In your experience, 25 years after the Program, how much has that sentence been followed?

[Answer] As for me personally, I am a great adherent of this thought. I think that any interference from a position of power, from a position of authority, or from a position of one's office, in intellectual and cultural life, is dangerous to society as a whole and prevents its free democratic development. There are no systems of values, and there is no theory of knowledge, that would justify anyone's right to have a monopoly on evaluating the values of culture, science, and thought. On the contrary within the very framework of scientific, social, and cultural creation, forces are formed that in a sort of dialectical relationship, a conflict, verify the correctness of the corresponding positions and solutions. And this judge from within--not from outside--is the only one called upon to give an answer as to whether, a thought is correct and scientific.

[Question] Are there any basic differences between the draft Program and the Program? Or are the differences only in the refinements?

[Answer] I participated in some of the finalizing, but it was more stylistic and technical. The main ideological perceptions and formulations remained unchanged. Only a better form was sought, and the



historical moment in which we were adopting the Program was taken into account, so that it would not appear too pretentious and be clear enough.

[Question] When was the membership acquainted with the Program?

[Answer] I think that the membership was informed that work was being done on the Program. But it was not informed about the specific issues that were being discussed. In any case, the documents were not presented to the membership, but rather to high party forums.

[Question] There was none of what today we call public discussion?

[Answer] In the sense of the public discussion of the constitution, there was none.

[Question] You participated in the creation of the Program and the 1963 Constitution. How did self-management receive an institutional form?

[Answer] The 1963 Constitution institutionalized self-management as a constitutional principle. This did not develop much, less than the 1974 Constitution, but it defined the content of self-management and self-management as a characteristic of the political system and of the basic entities in the socialist system. The Constitution did its work, and the Program did its own. The Program is an ideological and political document, and the Constitution was one constituting institutions, one that constituted the forms. Naturally, many of the Program's ideas were included in the Constitution. But each, at its own level, tried to define a self-managing political and social system.

[Question] Did the radicalism in the Program, the filling, which is perhaps not popular today, go beyond our present documents and our present congresses, which are in a way too normativistic?

[Answer] That is correct. The time of the program was a time of uncovering problems, a "metaphysical" time, while this is a realistic and positivistic one. Everything is positivistic, positive formulas, systems, documents...

[Question] Why has the working method changed, and why is the commission working method so popular today?

[Answer] The reason lies in the fact the guiding ideas have not been formulated. They are being sought. In the second place, the thought process of decision-making is too decentralized. One seeks participation by representatives from each republic and province, followed by representatives of politics, and representatives of science; then it is one more representative body instead of a thinking one.

[Question] Isn't it for similar reasons that our political science has languished?

[Answer] Themes are repeated, or old solutions are idealized; not much new is sought. The search is more along the lines of denying and challenging, which weakens the strength of science.

In developing self-management and federalism, along the way we have fragmented our social and political system. This fragmentation also applies to the areas of thought, culture, and spirit. This fragmentation is "unified" by combining individuals, who are frequently at different levels, with different commitments and interests. It is verbal and local. In previous periods, including during the time of the creation of the Program, we were more unified. In the true sense, we belonged to one movement, animatedly seeking to gain recognition for it, since it was a new one and in our opinion better than anything previous. This gave strength to individuals and groups, and combined them.

Today there is no synthesis, just ununified sets of "ideas."

[Question] From what you have said so far, could it be concluded that a great deal depends on a few key people?

[Answer] Undoubtedly. Due to the existence and role of Tito and Kardelj, we were in a position to unite. Great ideas and great causes require great people. Mediocrity has won among us today; ideas and people are average; and this has provided an opportunity for increasingly mediocre people to "rise."

It cannot be said that our society does not have talented and capable people. But society has not found a way to train and replace people more quickly. The replacement is carried out with the aid of formal collectivism, a set of the thoughts and influence of individuals, which frequently does not mean a productive matter. This slows down adopted decisions and makes them ineffective.

[Question] Today increasing popularity is being gained by books in which sensational things from the close or distant past appear, from our workers' movement... From everything that you have said, it appears that such sensational things did not occur when the Program was drawn up?

[Answer] Today various memoirs have appeared, various reminiscences by individuals, and they contain such "sensationalism." The more they contain, the more popular they are. There is a desire for sensationalism, which is proof of a certain passivization, and as soon as someone is passive he does not seek thought, but rather satisfaction, a superficial satisfaction. That is exhaustion.

Passivization has come because the system has been closed. Through the influence of different circumstances, difficulties, crises, and the change of generations, it has been closed up in itself. A closed system is essentially nonproductive. It is passive. It does not seek to be ventilated by new ideas; it is not critical.

[Question] When did this closing of the system begin?

[Answer] It began as early as the preparations for the 1974 Constitution and with the period following the 1974 Constitution. When the Constitution, like every legal document, closed the system, it transformed a living, vital practice into a system. Every system means a limitation of initiatives and actions, and a closing of certain loopholes in society. Thus, if you follow everything that is written and thought in Yugoslavia, people are continually referring not to some deep truth, to Marxist thought, but rather to the Constitution and the Law on Associated Labor. This is a paradox: that a legal document that is by itself limited and incomplete should be the basis for an action, although action has to be an activity of people, a living creative force, new ideas. What is happening today is an atmosphere of positivism and spiritual laziness, passiveness.

Whoever has nothing new, encouraging, and inspirational to say to people, to sharpen their minds, cites the Law on Associated Labor. This supports spiritual laziness. We also have a great deal of laziness in the areas of politics and science.

9909

CSO: 2800/409

END